



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/588,411	06/06/2000	Roger Wolff	13237-2575(MS-149368.1)	9449
27488	7590	12/29/2003	EXAMINER	
MERCHANT & GOULD P.O. BOX 2903 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903			SMITH, PETER J	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2176		7
DATE MAILED: 12/29/2003				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/588,411	WOLFF ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Peter J Smith	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 June 2000.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 06 June 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
  - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

**Attachment(s)**

- |                                                                                                                  |                                                                              |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                      | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ . |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                             | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>4,5,6</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .                                   |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to communications: application filed on 06/06/2000, IDS filed on 05/02/2002, 10/21/2002 and 05/09/2003.
2. Claims 1-22 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 10, and 19 are independent claims.

### ***Specification***

The claims are objected to because the lines are crowded too closely together, making reading and entry of amendments difficult. Substitute claims with lines one and one-half or double spaced on good quality paper are required. See 37 CFR 1.52(b).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beauregard et al. (hereafter referred to as Beauregard), US 5,974,413 filed 07/03/1997 in view of Bays et al. (hereafter referred to as Bays), US 6,519,603 filed 10/28/1999.**

**Regarding independent claim 1 and dependent claim 5,** Beauregard teaches receiving a string of text in a recognizer library in fig. 7 and col. 5 lines 12-56. Beauregard does not teach using recognizer plug-ins. Beauregard also does not specifically teach annotating a string of text with a plurality of labels and transmitting the labels to the application program module. Bays

teaches annotating a string of text with a plurality of labels in fig. 1, 4, col. 2 lines 47-50, and col. 3 lines 53-56.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Bays into Beauregard to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable for one of ordinary skill to use plug-in software modules for the recognizer library of Beauregard. Plug-in software was well known to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention and would have allowed for simple modification of and enhancement of the text strings which the recognizer library could have discerned. It would have been obvious and desirable to have annotated the text string with one of the service scripts of Beauregard to enhance the semantic interpretation (Bays col. 2 line 48) of the text string.

**Regarding dependent claim 2,** Beauregard does not teach synchronizing a plurality of labels received from the recognizer plug-in. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have designed the software to have synchronized the labels received before transmitting them to the application program module so that the program module could have processed the received labels in an organized way.

**Regarding dependent claim 3,** Beauregard teaches receiving a plurality of labels in an action library in fig. 7 and col. 5 lines 12-56. Beauregard teaches displaying a menu displaying a plurality of actions based on a label in fig. 9. Beauregard does not teach using action plug-in software. It would have been obvious and desirable for one of ordinary skill to use plug-in software modules for the action library of Beauregard. Plug-in software was well known to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention and would have allowed for simple modification of and enhancement of the actions implemented by the action library.

Art Unit: 2176

**Regarding dependent claim 4,** Beauregard teaches comparing a string of text with a plurality of stored strings to determine a match in fig. 7 and col. 5 lines 12-56. Beauregard teaches performing an action based on a match in fig. 7 and col. 5 lines 12-56. Beauregard does not teach labeling the string of text with an associated stored label of the matched stored string. Bays teaches attaching a semantic label to a string of text in fig. 1 and 4, col. 2 lines 47-50, and col. 3 lines 53-56.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Bays into Beauregard to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have modified the action of Beauregard to have attached a semantic label to the string of text so that the semantic interpretation of the string of text could have been known.

**Regarding dependent claim 6,** Beauregard teaches performing a text string service in fig. 7 and col. 5 lines 12-56 which would have modified the electronic document being worked on.

**Regarding dependent claim 7,** Beauregard teaches causing the application program module to fire an event within an object model of the application program module and causing a piece of code associated with the event to be executed when at least one of the plurality of labels is determined in fig. 7, 9, and col. 5 lines 12-56.

**Regarding dependent claim 8,** Beauregard does not teach determining the language of the string of text if the language is not recognized by the recognizer library. Language software was well known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have

Art Unit: 2176

combined language software with Beauregard to created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have determined the language of unrecognized commands so that invention could have been geographically portable and would have been able to have been marketed in countries using a different language than the default of the invention.

**Regarding dependent claim 9,** Beauregard teaches the use of multiword strings to determine actions in fig. 7 and col. 5 lines 12-56. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used this ability to implement context aided annotation. Use of context to implement annotation was well known in the art at the time of the invention and it would have been obvious and desirable to have used it so that the annotations of the text strings could have been more accurate.

**Regarding independent claim 10,** Beauregard teaches determining whether an entered string of text matches one of a plurality of stored strings and determining an action if the string is matched in fig. 7 and col. 5 lines 12-56. Beauregard does not teach determining a label associated with the matched stored string. Bays teaches attaching a semantic label to a string of text in fig. 1 and 4, col. 2 liens 47-50, and col. 3 lines 53-56:

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Bays into Beauregard to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have modified the action of Beauregard to have attached a semantic label to the string of text so that the semantic interpretation of the string of text could have been known.

**Regarding dependent claim 11,** Beauregard teaches determining a set of actions associated with a string of text in fig. 7 and 9, and col. 5 lines 12-56. Beauregard does not teach

Art Unit: 2176

a label associated with the string of text. Bays teaches attaching a semantic label to a string of text in fig. 1 and 4, col. 2 lines 47-50, and col. 3 lines 53-56.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Bays into Beauregard to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have modified the action of Beauregard to have attached a semantic label to the string of text so that the semantic interpretation of the string of text could have been known.

**Regarding dependent claim 12,** Beauregard teaches in fig. 9 and col. 5 lines 12-56 displaying an indication indicating that a label has been found.

**Regarding dependent claim 13,** Beauregard teaches determining that a user has selected a string of text and in response, displaying a plurality of actions to the user in fig. 7 and 9, and col. 5 lines 12-56.

**Regarding dependent claims 14 and 15,** Beauregard teaches receiving an indication that one of the plurality of actions has been selected and in response to receiving an indication that one of the plurality of actions has been selected, then causing the application program module to execute the selected action in fig. 7 and 9, and col. 5 lines 12-56.

**Regarding dependent claim 16,** Beauregard teaches wherein the application program module executes the selected action by determining whether an action library assigned to the action is available and if so, then receiving instructions from the action dynamic link library assigned to the selected action in fig. 7 and 9, and col. 5 lines 12-56.

**Regarding dependent claim 17,** Beauregard does not teach if an action plug-in dynamic link library is not available, then using a Uniform Resource Locator assigned to the action to

Art Unit: 2176

navigate to a Web site and download the action plug-in dynamic link library. Beauregard does teach the use of third party software in fig. 7. The technique of using a Uniform Resource Locator assigned to the action to navigate to a Web site and download software in the event it was not available was well known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention and would have been obvious to have included in Beauregard so that it could have automatically stayed up-to-date.

**Regarding dependent claim 18,** Beauregard does not determine metadata associated with the string of text. Bays teaches determining metadata associated with a string of text in fig. 1 and 4, col. 2 lines 47-50, and col. 3 lines 53-56. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Bays into Beauregard to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the metadata identification of Bays to have improved the action determination of Beauregard.

**Regarding dependent claim 22,** Beauregard teaches determining whether an entered string of text matches one of a plurality of stored strings and determining an action if the string is matched in fig. 7 and col. 5 lines 12-56. Beauregard does not teach determining a label associated with the matched stored string. Bays teaches attaching a semantic label to a string of text in fig. 1 and 4, col. 2 lines 47-50, and col. 3 lines 53-56.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Bays into Beauregard to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have modified the action of Beauregard to have attached a semantic label to the string of text so that the semantic interpretation of the string of text could have been known.

**5. Claims 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beauregard et al. (hereafter referred to as Beauregard), US 5,974,413 filed 07/03/1997.**

**Regarding independent claim 19,** Beauregard teaches an application program module for creating an electronic document in col. 5 lines 51-56. Beauregard teaches a recognizer library and an action library in fig. 7 and col. 5 lines 12-56. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have connected the recognizer and action libraries of Beauregard to an application program module for creating electronic documents so that documents could have been produced more efficiently.

**Regarding dependent claim 20,** Beauregard teaches the use of third party software in fig. 7, but does not specifically teach the use of plug-ins. Plug-ins were well known at the time of the invention for allowing easy modification and enhancement of software. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the knowledge of plug-ins with the recognizer library so that the library could have been easily modified and enhanced.

**Regarding dependent claim 21,** Beauregard teaches the use of third party software in fig. 7, but does not specifically teach the use of plug-ins. Plug-ins were well known at the time of the invention for allowing easy modification and enhancement of software. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the knowledge of plug-ins with the action library so that the library could have been easily modified and enhanced.

***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Beauregard et al., US 6,438,545 filed 04/15/1999 discloses a semantic user interface. Gipson, US 5,900,004 patented 05/04/1999 discloses interactively formatting a document while the user types. White et al., US 6,618,733 B1 priority filed 04/11/2000 discloses displaying in a view window information characterizing semantics of relations between objects.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter J Smith whose telephone number is 703-305-5931. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays-Fridays 7:00am-3:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H Feild can be reached on 703-305-9792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

PJS  
December 3, 2003



JOSEPH H. FEILD  
PRIMARY EXAMINER